

tend to state what have ever been my ideas of the true foundations of republican government.

Let us start first with the inquiry, what is the true basis, or the true bases if they are mixed, of all representative governments?—Necessarily they must be one of three different characters. Outside of these three different bases there exist none other. Then I say that the foundations of representative government must be either persons or property, or a mixed basis of persons and property. Latitude, longitude, city, country, do not affect the case in the least, in any fair argument upon this point.

What is the true theory of republican government? It is the political equality of all men who are peers in the State, and the right of every man, a political peer in the State, to an equal degree and amount of representation in the representative body. That one man resides down upon the Potomac, and that another man resides in Baltimore city, affects this no more than that one man is named George and another Harry. All who are political peers in the State have an equal right in that representative body which is supposed to set forth and organize public sentiment into law. Who denies a proposition so plain as that?

And yet, under our present system, who does not know that the citizen of Charles, the peninsular citizen, as they have been very well termed, is represented, at least in this hall, to the extent of five or ten citizens residing elsewhere. Is that right? Is the system which tolerates it right in its organization? I say that upon the ground that every free citizen in this hall is the political peer of every other, it is wrong just as clearly as that it takes five units to make five, or ten units to make ten. Then I say that upon the doctrine of persons alone being the proper basis of representation our present system is clearly wrong.

Suppose then you declare that property is the basis of representation, as some have argued, and said let us have representation according to taxation. It must be according to population, according to taxation, or by mixing the two and making a mixed representation of persons and property. What other? All this talk about the negro in representation, mark you, is altogether sound and fury, signifying nothing. My friends come into this hall and charge me with inconsistency because having said the negro was a human being with human rights, denying at all times religious, social or political equality. I refuse him representation now. I would like to know where they put their jewel, consistency, when they come into this house and deny the negro any rights at all, and as soon as we give him human rights, demand for him all the white man's rights, and say that he is entitled to representation?

Mr. CLARKE. Under the present constitution the negro has representation?

Mr. SANDS. I meant to mention that, and to show you where it is lodged. I make this point of consistency; and I am willing to let the world put mine opposite theirs. I come here and declare for the negro human rights; the right to be a husband, a father, a free man; and there I stop, denying the equality of the race, or that they could enjoy social or political equality with the white man. That was my doctrine. The doctrine upon the other side was that the negro was only fit for slavery; had not even the right of personal liberty; that he had not a right to the fruit of one drop of his sweat, or one hour of his toil; and as soon as we set up our doctrine, they go way beyond us and say that he not only has the rights we would accord him, but has the same rights that I have and you have to be represented here. Measure the inconsistencies, and where mine goes a furlong my friends will go a whole mile.

The doctrine has been urged here that the negro has been represented in the federal government. I say that that is just as false in fact as it is true in theory. Who denies that in the Constitution of the United States representation was accorded to the States under the three-fifths rule for their negro population? Who denies that, as a matter of theory? Now, I ask the gentleman, as a matter of fact, where a single negro slave ever had a representative in the halls of our national legislature? Gentlemen must recollect that the negroes number millions, and if they had been entitled to representation they would have had a delegation there, strong in numbers, almost equal in numbers to that of their white masters; and those representatives would have been the first men to inaugurate what are called the abolition doctrines there, and push them to the wall. I say it is a logical monstrosity to assert that four millions of negroes, if they had been represented on the floors of your national legislature, would not at all times have been crying out for their liberties.

These are the reasons why I assert that in fact it is as false that negroes have ever been represented, as it is true in theory that they are. The theory is one thing. The fact, as my friends know, for they can see it just as clearly as I can, is another. They know that in point of fact three or four million negroes were never represented.

How have they been represented, if represented at all? Represented by a species of legislation which has been intended to spread and perpetuate, to eternalize if possible, the institution of slavery. They have it in the Constitution of the United States; they have it in the act of 1793; and they have it in the act of 1850, which passed by the votes of the representatives, as gentlemen pretend, of these three or four millions of negroes, bound tighter than ever by the votes of the men who